

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

mN

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/699,103	11/03/2003	Stewart H. Sonnenfeldt	16440.4033	3714
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE, LLP IP PROSECUTION DEPARTMENT			EXAMINER	
			TIV, BACKHEAN	
SUITE 1600	PARK PLAZA SUITE 1600		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
IRVINE, CA 92614-2558			2151	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/699,103	SONNENFELDT ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Backhean Tiv	2151			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence address			
Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY	Y IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 N	MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS			
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUN 36(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MCs, cause the application to become A	ICATION. I reply be timely filed INTHS from the mailing date of this communication. INTHS BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 N	lovember 2003.				
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.				
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-35</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.		•			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-35</u> are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.	•			
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	kammer. Note the attache	od Office Action of John F 10-132.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
application from the International Burea	u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	•			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Notice of Informal Patent Application					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:					

Art Unit: 2151

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-35 are pending in this application.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-14,29, drawn to identification of online meetings, classified in class 709, subclass 204.
- II. Claims 15-28,30-34, drawn to transmission of telephonic signals to different types of networks, classified in class 370, subclass 260.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the combination is drawn more to the identification of online meetings. The subcombination has separate utility such as connecting one telephone network to another telephone/data network.

The examiner has required restriction between combination and subcombination inventions. Where applicant elects a subcombination, and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if

Art Unit: 2151

any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

Art Unit: 2151

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

A telephone call was made to Orrick, Herington, & Sutfliffe LLp on 6/26/07 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Art Unit: 2151

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Backhean Tiv whose telephone number is (571) 272-5654. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Backhean Tiv 2151 6/26/07 Defencia markie Wollner SPE Art Unit 2151

Page 5